

# REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE TO THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Charles A. Garris, Jr., Chair  
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate  
October 7, 2014

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I am delighted to extend to all present our warm welcome. I take special pleasure in welcoming new faculty and informing them about the Faculty Senate and inviting them to participate in our work. Having worked with Chairman Carbonell closely over the past year on issues of faculty governance, I would also like to thank him for his singularly strong leadership and commitment in advancing GW towards ever higher recognition as a major research university and his willingness to take an enormous amount of his valuable time to listen and understand the world of the faculty.

As stated by Chair Carbonell in his report, an important current element in the efforts of the Board of Trustees is the improvement in five specific governance areas which are specifically addressed in the *Faculty Code* and other governance documents. As Chair Carbonell stated, these five areas identified by the Board of Trustees Task Force of Faculty Governance were: (1) Academic Freedom; (2) Participation in governance; (3) ATP Processes and Procedures; (4) Appointment and review of Deans; and (5) School Governance Rules and Bylaws. The first of these on academic freedom was collaboratively examined by the Task Force and the Faculty Senate PEAFF committee last year. As a result of that collaborative effort, Faculty Senate resolution 14/2 was formulated. This resolution, while leaving intact the faculty's rights to academic freedom, modified the *Faculty Code* to better address the changing academic environment. The resolution was presented to the Faculty Senate at its May 9 meeting, was debated thoroughly and amended due to concerns of the faculty at-large. The Faculty Senate then voted and passed it unanimously. The resolution went on to the Board of Trustees and was adopted as amended by the Board at its June meeting.. The recommended changes will appear in the *Faculty Code*. In the four remaining areas, this strong collaboration between Faculty Senate committees and the committees of the Board of Trustees is expected to continue, and the processes that we followed with Senate resolution 14/2 will be repeated. I am very optimistic that significant improvements will be made in the four remaining areas which will help GW move forward with its aspirations.

It should be stated at the outset that the current *Faculty Code* embodies a proven model of shared governance between the faculty and the administration that has evolved incrementally and improved regularly since its origins in the 1930's. Using this excellent model, the GW faculty have had a synergistic and long-standing tradition of sharing with officers of the administration the responsibility for effective operation of the departments, schools, and the University as a whole. However, at this juncture while we are embarking on new strategic directions, it is appropriate to take a broader look at the *Faculty Code* and look for new ways of improving it to suit our aspirations. It is fully expected that the changes proposed by the Board of Trustees will build upon this strong foundation yet will provide improved mechanisms of shared governance to in the remaining four areas which will expedite achieving our goals.

In my presentation today, I will report on the extensive body of work accomplished by the Faculty Senate in the 2013-2014 academic year under the able leadership of Professor Scheherazade Rehman and our committee chairs, ongoing Senate projects and activities, and committee activities for the 2014-2015 academic year. First, however, in anticipation of our work on faculty governance and for the benefit of new faculty who are not well versed on the our governance traditions, I will briefly discuss the concept of “shared governance,” and how it has historically been understood at GW as well as at respected peer and aspirational institutions.

In invoking the term “shared governance”, one automatically tends to think of a democratic ideal that elicits jubilant support by all parties. One would be hard pressed to find a member of the faculty, staff, or administration who does not laud its perceived concept. However, upon deeper reflection, as with many aphorisms, “shared governance” can be different things to different people. There is certainly much written on the subject.

One view of “shared governance” has been termed the “Stakeholder View.” In the “Stakeholder View”, “shared governance” means that a decision-maker assembles an array of stakeholders (faculty, students, administrators, board members, staff, etc.) giving all parties an opportunity to voice his/her opinion. Once participants have discussed the issues, the decision-maker makes the final decision, presumably after having given serious consideration to the full range of opinions and recommendations. Because "input" is sought and wide communication takes place, governance is said by some to be shared. This mode of communication is typical of industrial quality improvement programs and is common in community colleges and the like. Opportunities for stakeholders to vent can be quite therapeutic and such events can provide useful information to decision-makers. “Stakeholder View” communication is certainly preferable to autocratic rule, but it is NOT “shared governance” as understood at fine academic institutions.

An entirely different view of “shared governance” was formulated in 1966 in a publication entitled “*Statement of Government of Colleges and Universities*” which was jointly adopted by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). We might term this the “Academic View” of “shared governance.”

Even though the *Statement on Government* recognizes that final institutional authority resides ultimately in the governing board and that the board entrusts day-to-day administration to the president, it does not conceive of the college or university in hierarchical terms where the faculty is always subordinate to the president and board. On the contrary, it portrays the well-run institution as one in which board and president shares decision-making power with the faculty. What chiefly distinguishes the classic understanding of the “Academic View” of “shared governance” from the “Stakeholder View” is the idea that the faculty not only possess the right to be heard in institutional decision-making; they actually possess primary responsibility or authority for reaching decisions in their areas of expertise. Such areas include curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.

The delegation of primary responsibility to faculty in academic matters is founded upon the assumption that faculty are professionals with special training and knowledge, and thus

distinctly qualified to exercise decision-making authority in their areas of expertise. Faculty appointments, promotions, the granting of tenure, and revocations of tenure, for example, are the primary responsibility of the faculty because the faculty's judgment is central to general educational policy and because scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues. Thus, this delegation of primary responsibility to faculty is the heart of “shared governance.”

As has been stated by Chair Carbonell numerous times, it is the excellence of the faculty that distinguishes the very best universities. Having faculty of such high caliber, it is only logical to trust them with decision-making responsibilities in their areas of expertise. This is “shared governance.”

I am pleased to report that our current system of “shared governance” under the *Faculty Code* is as I have described it. In the past year, “shared governance” has served us well. Working side-by-side with the Board of Trustees and the administration on a wide range of issues, the faculty has had a large impact on the directions and policies of the university. Today, “shared governance” is alive and well at GW. While “shared governance” is by no means limited to the activities of the Faculty Senate, the following report is testament to the contributions of the Faculty Senate under this revered system in the past year. I am very optimistic that the Faculty Assembly taking place one year from today, the Chair of the Executive Committee will report that as a result of improvements in the *Faculty Code* and other governance documents resulting from the Board of Trustees efforts, “shared governance” is even stronger.

## FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

I will now begin my report on Faculty Senate activities during the past year. To save time, I will just state the titles of the resolutions and reports. The details can be found on-line under “Minutes” at the Faculty Senate website.

From May 2013 through May 2014, the Faculty Senate held 10 regular meetings during which it considered and adopted 6 resolutions. Because 4 resolutions were considered and adopted at the May 9, 2014 Senate meeting, the first meeting of the 2014-15 session, these were transmitted to the University Administration for its response along with resolutions from the 2013-14 session.

The Administrative response to all of these resolutions was concurrence by the administration, with the exception of two. These responses to Resolutions 14/1 and 14/3 are noted below.

### RESOLUTION 13/1, “A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE POLICY AND PROCEDURES”

Professor Charles Garris, Chair of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, introduced Resolution 13/1 presented a resolution to adopt a new university policy entitled: . “Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Policy and Procedures.” The policy was intended recognize the importance of fostering a campus climate in which sexual

harassment and sexual violence is prevented, reported, and adjudicated appropriately and fairly. Resolution 13/1 was adopted as amended.

**RESOLUTION 13/2 “A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE POLICY ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND COMMITMENT FOR FACULTY AND INVESTIGATORS ” (October 11, 2013)**

On behalf of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF), Professor Charles A. Garris, Jr., Chair, introduced Resolution 13/2. He noted that the Faculty Senate approved a Policy on Conflicts of Interest 8 years ago in 2005. Recently the compliance office of the National Institutes of Health reviewed this Policy and forwarded several suggestions for Policy modifications to GW. The Administration did not feel that these changes were very significant as they seemed to be clarifications to the current Policy. Resolution 13/2 calls for the Senate’s approval of the amended (or redlined) version of the Policy distributed with the meeting agenda. 13/2 was adopted unanimously.

**RESOLUTION 13/3, “A RESOLUTION ON THE ESTABLISHED PROCEDURES FOR APPROVING ANY CHANGES TO THE *FACULTY CODE* OR FACULTY POLICIES THAT MAY BE RECOMMENDED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE”**

On behalf of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF), Professor Charles A. Garris, Jr., Chair, introduced Resolution 13/3. Which stated that the Faculty Senate expects that any changes to the Faculty Code or Faculty Policies recommended by the Board of Trustees Governance Task Force will adhere to the

University’s long-established and unbroken tradition and procedures of shared governance,

which require the Faculty Senate, as the elected representative and authorized agent of the Faculty, to consider and act on changes to the Faculty Code or Faculty Policies that are proposed by the Administration, the Board of Trustees or other members of the University community before such changes are submitted to the Board of Trustees for final action. Resolution 13/3 was adopted as amended by a vote of 29 in favor, 2 opposed, and none abstaining. The Administration indicated that its response to this Resolution would be on hold pending the outcome of working groups’ review of governance.

**RESOLUTION 13/4, “A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE POLICY ON RETAINING INCOMPLETE GRADES ON STUDENTS’ TRANSCRIPTS”**

Professor Robert J. Harrington, Chair, of the Educational Policy Committee, introduced the Resolution, which recommends that, effective with courses taught in the fall 2014 semester, the "I" indicator on student's transcripts be removed once an actual grade has been reported and recorded. The University's current policy retains the record of Incomplete grades on students' transcripts even after a final grade has been assigned for the course. Following agreement that minor editorial changes be made to standardize the format of the Resolution, Resolution 13/4 was adopted as amended.

### **RESOLUTION 13/5, “A RESOLUTION TO ALERT STUDENTS WHO ARE DOING SUBSTANDARD ACADEMIC WORK EARLY IN THE SEMESTER”**

On behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, Professor Harrington, Chair, introduced the Resolution. Resolution 13/5 encourages faculty to assign graded work early in the semester, but no later than the fifth week of the semester. It also encourages faculty to enter information about students' academic performance, especially those who are doing substandard work, into the Faculty Feedback System in Banner as soon as this information is available so that it can be accessed by undergraduate school and athletic advisors. An amendment was made to the Resolution to make it clear that this procedure would apply to alert "undergraduate" students. Following agreement that minor editorial changes be made to standardize the format of the Resolution. Resolution 13/5 was adopted as amended.

### **RESOLUTION 13/6, “A RESOLUTION TO UPGRADE INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS SEEKING TO REGISTER FOR COURSES”**

Professor Robert J. Harrington, Chair, of the Educational Policy Committee, introduced the Resolution. The Resolution expresses the view that students deserve adequate information before registering online, and they may wish to know whether their own interests and major concentrations will be advanced by courses they would choose, and further, faculty teach best to students who have selected courses appropriate to their interests. Consequently, Resolution 13/6 encourages faculty to submit to the Registrar one of three kinds of information about each course to be offered the following semester:

- A draft syllabus for the upcoming term, clearly designated as tentative and subject to revision before the course begins, or
- a syllabus used in a previous version of the course, clearly marked as subject to change, or
- a form provided by the Registrar including such information as the course aims in a paragraph briefly describing what students will be expected to learn.

Resolution 13 / 6 was adopted as amended by the Senate.

### **RESOLUTION 14/1 “A RESOLUTION TO REQUEST INCREASED UNIVERSITY CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS”**

Introduced by Chair Murli Gupta, the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits), the resolution noted that the University's proportionate contribution to health care costs had decreased and that faculty and staff proportionate contributions had significantly increased, particularly over the past year. The resolution was amended at the meeting; in its final form it urged that the University and the Board of Trustees pay a higher proportion of the medical and prescription drug expenses without reducing increases to merit compensation. Resolution 14/2 was adopted as amended.

The Administration in its response indicated that it sent this resolution to the Board of Trustees and that the 3% benefit pool and the 3% merit pool remained the same for FY 15.

**RESOLUTION 14/2, “A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE *FACULTY CODE* WITH RESPECT TO ACADEMIC FREEDOM”**

Introduced by Professor Charles Garris in behalf of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF), the resolution proposed a modification to Article II. of the *Faculty Code*, Article II being the section concerning Academic Freedom. The proposed wording was a result of joint efforts by the Board of Trustees’ Governance Task Force and the PEAF Committee to arrive at appropriate language that would be consistent with the practice of academic freedom at GW, and would also be a positive addition to the Code. Resolution 14/2 was adopted as amended. The Administration in its response indicated this was recommended to the Board of Trustees for its approval and that the Board approved this amendment at its June 19, 2014 meeting.

**RESOLUTION 14/3, “A RESOLUTION ON THE NEED FOR A LONG TERM BUDGET MODEL”**

Introduced on behalf of the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting by Professor Anthony Yezer, the Resolution proposed that, in addition to a new model that will replace the Unified Budget Model now in use by seven of the University schools, another improvement to the University’s budget process be developed and deployed promptly -- that of a multi-year budget model capable of analyzing fiscal implications for operating surpluses and alternative revenue and cost scenarios. This new model would make it possible to assess issues such as the fiscal implications of alternative future plans for development, including the Corcoran acquisition/partnership. The Resolution further urged that the model resulting from this effort should be shared with the Faculty Senate. Resolution 14/3 was adopted.

The Administration in its response indicated the action recommendation is fully understood and agreed this is desirable. Work has begun on developing a multi-year budget model.

**RESOLUTION 14/4, “A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION”**

Resolution 14/4 was introduced under the agenda item, “Introduction of Resolutions” as is customary for these. Resolution 14/4 expresses the Senate’s appreciation for Professor Scheherazade Rehman’s three years of service on the Senate Executive Committee, the last session (2013-14) as Chair. Resolution 14/4 was adopted by acclamation. President Knapp presented the Resolution to Professor Rehman, who expressed her appreciation for the sentiments expressed. The Administration in its response heartily endorsed this resolution.

**REPORTS**

From May 2013 through May 2014 Session, 20 reports were made at the regular meetings of the Faculty Senate. A summary of the reports follows:

#### **UPDATE ON THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET (May 10, 2013)**

Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz provided the Senate with a picture of the University's overall financial health as well as his view on a number of issues. Vice President Katz said he thought it is important for GW to stay the course and continue to improve the institution during this time of opportunity, when many educational institutions have either slowed down or even stopped making progress. In some cases other institutions have actually gone backward. He said continuing to invest in improvements to the University also makes it stronger and less vulnerable to what is transpiring in the marketplace.

#### **REMARKS BY NELSON A. CARBONELL, JR., CHAIR, BOARD OF TRUSTEES (September 13, 2013)**

Chair Carbonell began by saying that as he has told the Board that the University's faculty is the reason the Board can accomplish anything at the institution. So the faculty is something that should be cherished and nurtured. Mr. Carbonell said that the Board is very enthusiastic at the prospect of working with the faculty, and that he had encouraged Board members to reach out to faculty leaders, as well as faculty anywhere in the institution in order to accomplish this.

Mr. Carbonell then spoke about resolutions and actions taken by the Board of Trustees at its meeting in May, 2013. He stated that in 2013 the University engaged in a broad process led by Provost Lerman to develop a new Strategic Plan. This Plan was enthusiastically approved by the Board in May of 2013. In light of the Plan, the Board reviewed its Bylaws and made changes to these. Outgoing Board Chairman Ramsey put forward a resolution, which was adopted by the Board, that charged the Board of Trustees under the new Board Chair with reviewing the *Faculty Code* and recommending changes if necessary.

#### **UPDATE ON THE LYTERATI PROJECT (FACULTY ANNUAL REPORTS) (September 13, 2013)**

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Dianne Martin presented an update on the status of the online faculty annual report system. The good news is that there are only about 40 faculty [out of 1100] who did not manage to get their reports filed through the Lyterati system. This was considered a very good result as the technology turned out to be a little more difficult to use than anticipated.

#### **BRIEF UPDATE ON CHANGES TO THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY REQUESTED BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH (September 13, 2013)**

Vice Provost Martin next turned to a short overview of changes requested by the National Institutes of Health to the University's Conflict of Interest Policy. The Senate will recall that over a year ago it approved an addendum to the faculty Conflict of Interest and Commitments Policy because of new requirements imposed by NIH on all faculty involved in Public Health Service research. With the Senate's help the Policy was amended without the Policy undergoing total revision, but it was understood that it would probably be a good idea to revisit the entire Policy with a view toward streamlining it and pulling out a lot of the

procedural information so there would remain a clear Policy that the faculty could follow and understand. In addition, there is a need for procedural forms to be updated.

## **UPDATE ON EMPLOYEE FRINGE BENEFITS CONSULTATION AND BENEFITS FOR THE 2014 PLAN YEAR (September 13, 2013)**

Vice President for Human Resources Sabrina Ellis presented the update on employee benefits for the 2014 plan year. She acknowledged the many individuals across the University, particularly members of the Benefits Advisory Committee and the Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (including fringe benefits), who have helped to work with staff in the Human Resources office to review a myriad of policies and develop the new benefit plan, as well as review relevant provisions of the soon-to be-implemented Affordable Care Act.

## **OVERVIEW OF THE UNIVERSITY'S INITIATIVES IN CHINA (October 11, 2013)**

Provost Lerman by stating that in the University's Strategic Plan there is a strong component of globalization as one of the key strategies for the University. He reported that has a number of educational research programs engaging with China over many years including the Sigur Center in the Elliott School of International Affairs (ESIA). Also, Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (CCAS), the School of Business, the School of Public Health and Health Services, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the College of Professional Studies, and the Gelman Library have China programs. GW also has exchange programs with a number of Chinese educational and research organizations. An area embodied in the Strategic Plan is the growth in the numbers of international students from China. Recently the University opened a Confucius Institute which will conduct work undertaken by CCAS and focus on Chinese language and culture education. Provost Lerman said that he has appointed an Advisory Committee of faculty who have expertise in China. The group will help create and advise on the strategies that GW will use going forward.

## **STATEMENT ON REVISION OF THE *FACULTY CODE* (October 11, 2013)**

On behalf of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF), Professor Charles A. Garris, Jr., Chair, introduced Resolution 13/3. The resolution was in response Chair Carbonell's announcement that the Board of Trustees will form a task force to discuss revision of the *Faculty Code*. The resolution stated that it is appropriate and expected that any emendations of the Faculty Code recommended by the Carbonell Task Force will follow our established historical process and be presented to the PEAF committee as designated by the Faculty Senate for its analysis and evaluation, and subsequent recommendations to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate may accept or reject those changes. Those accepted will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for its consideration. The statement announced that a resolution to this effect will be presented at the November 8, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting.

## **DISCUSSION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN DRAFT (October 12, 2013)**



Provost Lerman said that everyone should have received on Wednesday afternoon an email with the link to the draft of the University's Strategic plan on the Provost's website. The Faculty Assembly on October 2 included a briefing on the outlines of the plan. The draft is a document that will evolve in response to feedback that will continue to be received from the University community, including the Trustees at their October Board meeting. Work on the plan is expected to continue throughout the fall semester, and the hope and expectation is that the plan will reach a finalized stage that the University can commit to as the plan of record, to be delivered to the Board at its February meeting.

#### **UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (November 8, 2013)**

Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations Mike Morsberger presented the update. He began by giving an overview of the kind of philanthropy the University has been able to secure from private sources over the course of the past 4 years. For 2013 he reported a total of \$103 million raised. He noted that 22 gifts exceeding \$1 million were obtained.

The Development Office processed 27,000 individual gifts, but the 22 million dollar gifts accounted for 50% of everything raised. Vice President Morsberger said reported that there have been extensive preparations for an upcoming major capital campaign.

#### **REVIEW OF GW CULTURE, POLICIES AND PRACTICES (RESULTS OF THE PENN STATE FREEH REPORT TASK FORCE REVIEW) (November 8, 2013)**

Elliott School Associate Dean Doug Shaw, Task Force Co-Chair, gave a brief report. The charge to the Task Force was formed by a Steering Committee that was created following the report by Louis Freeh on events at Penn State. The Task Force was asked to use that report as an opportunity to examine GW's own practices, compliance, ethics, and also identify ways in which community responsibility might be enhanced. The mandate of this Task Force also echoed a similar exercise following the shootings at Virginia Tech with the formation of a Presidential Task Force on Safety and Security at GW. The Task Force presented several recommendations. None of the recommendations offered by the Task Force identify a deficiency so much as they identify areas where GW can continue to improve its processes and particular areas that might need periodic review.

#### **REPORT ON THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES (December 13, 2013)**

Dean Jeffrey Akman presented the Report, which provided a history of the School and its programs, its structure and organization, and some of challenges that accompany the School's unique organization within the University system.

#### **REPORT ON RESEARCH (January 10, 2014)**

Vice President for Research Leo Chalupa presented a report which focused on metrics that depict how the University is doing in key research areas, and initiatives put into place in the last year or so to make it easier for faculty to be more competitive in obtaining grants.

#### **REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN (February 14, 2014)**

University Librarian and Vice Provost for Libraries Geneva Henry presented her vision for the Libraries in the framework of the four themes of the University's Strategic Plan: cross-disciplinary collaboration, globalization, governance and policy, and citizenship and

leadership. Librarian Henry briefly outlined her priorities for the libraries, the first being getting research back into the libraries, primarily by engaging librarians with faculty research. The libraries can also offer shared research facilities where research about information is underway.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE NONCONCURRENCE PROCESS (February 14, 2014)**

Professor Murli Gupta, Acting Chair of the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (ASPP), presented a report which was in response to an unusual number of administrative nonconcurrences with departmental recommendations for a faculty member's promotion and tenure in the 2012-2013 academic year. ASPP was charged to examine the ways in which the promotion and tenure procedures are communicated to the faculty and how these procedures are navigated by the faculty chairs, deans, and other administrators across the University. ASPP stated that there is an urgent need for the following principles to be communicated:

1. The Provost's office, through the deans, specifies the expectations for timelines and standards for documentation of faculty members' progress through the promotion and tenure process.
2. All school and departmental Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) committees update and align their guidelines regularly and communicate their decisions.
3. A transparent and collaborative process between university, school, department, and program faculty is expected to ensure effective decision-making. This process will prevent decisions by deans, who might be new to the university, from explicating standards of performance that either are rejected by departments, by subgroups of faculty or by deans. While such disagreements form an important part of the academic process, new faculty need clear messages about expectations as the university transitions towards greater academic excellence.
4. Departmental bylaws and APT Committee guidelines align with and reflect the shared set of expectations, and work from similar templates. Schools who have not reviewed bylaws and guidelines are expected to do these on a regular schedule that is communicated at the beginning of each academic year. Schools are encouraged to separate bylaws, which can only be amended according to strict timelines, from APT Committee guidelines which may need more flexibility in interpretation and in application.

ASPP also provided a list of 8 process suggestions for faculty and administrators to expedite the ATP process.

## **ANNUAL REPORT ON CORE INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE (February 14, 2014)**

Provost Lerman presented the Report by displaying it in power point format. A copy of the Report is included with the minutes of the February 14, 2014 Faculty Senate meeting.

The report included many subjects including student enrollments, student performance, faculty number and demographics, research expenditures, faculty teaching loads, faculty salaries, and others.

## **GW BOARD OF TRUSTEES CHAIR NELSON A. CARBONELL, JR. CONCERNING THE WORK OF THE FACULTY GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE (March 21, 2014)**

Chair Carbonell reported on the work of the task force during the spring semester. The task force met with the faculty of each of the schools. Chair Carbonell described a set of five guiding principles drafted by the task force. They are: (1) participation in governance, that is, who gets to participate; (2) provisions for academic freedom; (3) the present appointment, promotion and tenure system and where it needs to go; and, (4) procedures for the appointment, review and retention of deans and academic administrators within schools and programs; and (5) school, departmental, center and institute rules and procedures and how those can be brought in line with the institution's aspirations. Chair Carbonell commented on each of these principles in some detail.

### **GW BOARD OF TRUSTEES CHAIR NELSON A. CARBONELL, JR. CONCERNING THE WORK OF THE FACULTY GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE (April 11, 2014)**

Chair Carbonell reviewed the draft guiding principles for the task force's work provided to the Senate at its March meeting. Based on strong feedback received from faculty, the task force framed and discussed with the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom a resolution to amend the *Faculty Code* section on academic freedom. The task force and the PEAFC Committee collaborated in two meetings to refine and edit the draft resolution, following which the Committee approved the resolution and sent it forward to the Senate Executive Committee. (This resolution will be considered at the May 9th Faculty Senate meeting and approved in amended form.) Chair Carbonell said that he thought the joint effort that resulted in this resolution represented a milestone in fruitful collaboration with the faculty, and would demonstrate going forward how the task force's work would proceed.

Chair Carbonell reported that the task force will in the next step of the process propose the creation of working groups composed of faculty, administrators and trustees to provide recommendations concerning each of the remaining four guiding principles [(1) expanding participation in governance for all full-time faculty; (2) the alignment of appointment, promotion and tenure procedures with the University's aspirations, along with ensuring consistent, transparent and high-quality processes and results across the entire University; (3) defining a consistent and appropriate role for the faculty and the administration in the selection, performance appraisal and retention of deans and other senior academic administrators; and, (4) with respect to school, departmental, center and institute rules and procedures, the creation of a consistent framework of faculty titles, policies and procedures across the University, while providing for the unique needs of each unit.] Working group membership to include faculty, administration, and trustees, and charters and timelines for these groups will be developed in collaboration with the administration and the Faculty Senate. The working groups will be chartered by the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic Affairs and it is expected their recommendations will be formulated and proposed during the 2014-15 academic year.

### **REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE LYTERATI PROJECT (FACULTY ANNUAL REPORTING SYSTEM) (April 11, 2014)**

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Dianne Martin provided an update on the work of the Faculty Information System Advisory Committee (FISAC) which was established at the request of the Faculty Senate due to unhappiness expressed by faculty members about the initial module's format. VP Martin reported that the Lyterati system has been improved to remove some of the difficulties in using the prior system so that CV's (now called the

Academic History) ingested into the system and made available for use by faculty preparing their Annual Reports can be more easily updated. In order to further address possible concerns about the confidentiality of data in the Lyterati system, another feature was added so that a faculty member can decide they do not want any of their data searchable, whether it is part of the annual report or academic history.

## **REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF BACKGROUND SCREENING CHECKS ON NEW FACULTY MEMBERS (May 9, 2014)**

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Dianne Martin reported on the implementation of background screening checks for new faculty members. Presently, new faculty members are screened only for verification of their employment and their academic credentials. The new policy, to be implemented in the fall, 2014 semester will add screening for criminal activity, sex offenses and verification of a valid social security number. These screenings will be conducted by the Human Resources staff and the review of these will be conducted by the Provost's Office if a question arises. Information received from background screenings will only be used to assist in determining a finalist's qualifications and suitability for the particular position they will fill and will not be used to discriminate on any basis protected by applicable law or University policy.

The Senate Executive Committee will request that a Senate Committee review this policy during the 2014-15 academic year so that Senate input may be provided concerning the detailed procedures to be worked out for the implementation of this policy.

## **FACULTY PERSONNEL MATTERS**

### **Nonconcurrences**

Three nonconcurrences were received by the Executive Committee shortly before the end of the 2014 spring semester. These were considered over the summer months by 2014-15 Executive Committee members. The first of these cases originated in Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, and the other two originated in the School of Business.

The Executive Committee recommended in each case that the departmental recommendations to promote and tenure the faculty members concerned be accepted, and that the administrative nonconcurrences be withdrawn. The administrative nonconcurrences were not withdrawn, and, pursuant to the procedure outlined in the *Faculty Code*, the departments appealed to President Knapp, seeking a final disposition of each of these matters individually. Following this, the Executive Committee learned that the administrative nonconcurrency in one case was sustained. Because of procedural objections raised by departments in two of the cases, these were referred back to the school in which they originated for further reconsideration before a final decision is made. The faculty members concerned were given a one-year extension of their contracts.

## **COMMITTEE PROJECTS FOR 2014- 2015**

The hard work of the Faculty Senate and much of the practice of shared governance occurs in the committees. I would like to take this opportunity to express the appreciation of the Faculty Senate to the Chairs of our committees and the faculty that participate. While the work of the committees often change as the academic year proceeds, the following list is an initial set of tasks that have been assigned to the committees by the Executive Committee:

1. APPOINTMENT, SALARY, AND PROMOTION POLICIES (INCLUDING FRINGE BENEFITS)

Chair: Robert J. Harrington; Liaison: Miriam Galston

- a. Joint with FP&B: Fringe Benefit Costs and Faculty Contributions; Health Care Costs and concerns.
- b. Published Criteria for Merit Pay increase.
- c. Nonconcurrence process. (PEAF and ASPP jointly.)
- d. Development of tutorial on proper nonconcurrence processes for deans and school wide personnel committees (Joint w. PEAF)
- e. Salary Equity Study.
- f. Follow up on background screening of new hires for faculty positions.

2. ATHLETICS AND RECREATION

Chair: Roger Fairfax; Liaison: Gregg A. Brazinsky

- a. Update on GW team and conference activities and the general GW athletic enterprise including transitions and hiring of coaches and recruitment of athletes.
- b. Status of GW's sport programs and meeting gender equity guidelines.
- c. Constraints to intercollegial athletics including financial and lack of fields and other facilities.
- d. Status National Collegiate Athletic Association's ten-year, on-campus, evaluation of George Washington's intercollegiate athletic programs.
- e. Report on academic performance of athletes.
- f. Update on recent policy decisions on the GW athletic enterprise.
- g. Status of intramural athletics including facilities and funding.

3. EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Chair: Michael S. Castleberry; Liaison: Marie Price

- a. Educational policy in the Confucius Institute concerning academic freedom; other issues.
- b. Sexual Harassment/Assault information sharing with educational entities.
- c. Policies of support by DSS for ASSISTING disabled students.

4. FISCAL PLANNING AND BUDGETING

Acting Chair : Joseph Cordes/ Acting Co-Chair : Brian Biles;  
Liaison: Paul M. Swiercz

- a. Joint with FP&B: Fringe Benefit Costs and Faculty Contributions
- b. Funding update on SEH and Corcoran.
- c. Joint with Research: Infrastructure expenditure status for SEH.
- d. FP&B: Corcoran Acquisition/Partnership; financial aspects jointly with Physical Facilities

- e. Status of new budget model replacing “Unified Budget Model.”
- f. Status of long-term financial model of university.

5. **HONORS AND ACADEMIC CONVOCATIONS**

Chair: Scheherazade S. Rehman; Liaison: Paula M. Lantz

- a. Continue assessing the suitability of nominees to be considered for the pool of possible candidates for honorary degrees according to University criteria.
- b. Other business as determined by the Committee.

6. **LIBRARIES**

Chair: David W. McAlevey; Liaison: Miriam Galston

- a. Plans for Library restructuring.
- b. Report On The Gelman Library System.
- c. Plans for new library funding from Provost’s office.

7. **PHYSICAL FACILITIES**

Chair: Kim Roddis; Liaison: Anton Sidawy

- a. SEH Infrastructure expenditure status (Joint with FP&B; Research)
- b. SEH Start-up and Operation: implementation of recommendations by SEH committees on Equipment and Operations
- c. Corcoran Partnership; financial aspects (Jointly with FP&B)
- d. Corcoran Museum 17th Street Building: understanding renovation/repair needs and plans.
- e. General Classrooms: implementation of plan submitted last year on modern teaching technology (internet access, displays, student/teacher communication) for general classrooms.
- f. Backfill Space: reallocation of vacated space in Tompkins, Phillips, and Corcoran.

8. **PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

Acting Chair: Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.; Liaison: Charles Garris

- a. Intellectual Property Policies: Patent Policy, Copyright Policy, Tangible Research Materials Policy (Joint with Research)
- b. Development of tutorial on proper nonconcurrency processes for deans and school wide personnel committees (Joint w. ASPP)
- c. Faculty Handbook
- d. Nonconcurrency Issues. Consideration of ASPP nonconcurrency process recommendations reported at the March 2014 Senate meeting. (jointly with ASPP)

9. **RESEARCH**

Chair: Robert Hawley; Liaison: Paula M. Lantz

- a. **Obstacles to Sponsored Research: Conduct open hearings/surveys for researchers**
  - b. **Infrastructure expenditure status or SEH (Joint with FP&B; Physical Facilities)**
  - c. **Intellectual Property Policies: Patent Policy, Copyright Policy, Tangible Research Materials Policy (Joint with PEAFF)**
  - d. **Classified Research Policy.**
10. **UNIVERSITY AND URBAN AFFAIRS**  
**Chair: Kathryn Newcomer; Liaison: Joyce Pulcini**
- a. **At the discretion of the Committee, continue outreach and community service activities as in previous years.**
11. **JOINT COMMITTEE OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS**  
**Acting Faculty Co-Chair: Jennifer Frey;**  
**Liaison: Sylvia Marotta-Walters**
- a. **Continue working in collaboration with students on issues of common interest.**

## **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

The 2014-2015 academic year will be exceptionally exciting for the Senate and the faculty as a whole. This will be a truly transformative year in the history of GW. We will have the opening of the Science and Engineering Hall, the integration of the Corcoran Gallery and Corcoran School into GW, the most major review of the *Faculty Code* in memory which will have great impact on the practice of shared governance, and the implementation of the Strategic Plan which includes new models for research and education both on-campus and internationally. I expect Faculty Senate committees will be very busy and contribute greatly to this transformation. The Executive Committee looks forward to working with you in all of your efforts to contribute to a better university. Please do join Senate committees and help with this enormous and exciting collaborative effort to move GW to new levels of recognition and excellence.

Thank you.

**Remarks by Nelson A. Carbonell, Jr., Chair, GW Board of Trustees**

**Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to all of you today. I have to say that, I am now one year older and hopefully more than one year wiser as chair, and it is an honor to serve the University in this capacity; one that is one of the greatest honors of my life so I appreciate all of the trust that has been invested in me.**

**If you look around the campus, you see a lot of construction: the Science and Engineering Hall, GW Museum, the Corcoran who recently became part of our family, and I think it is now under construction because if you're part of GW, you have to be under construction at some point. That's one of the rules.**

**The District Hall, which I think will create a fairly dramatic change in the campus, will house many of our students. Over the last 20 years one change has been that our students now live here and it's a different community when all the students are on campus than the one that was here when I came as an undergraduate or even the one that was here 20 years ago. So I think it's quite dramatic.**

**But I think the rumors that GW is all about the real estate are untrue. We are building these facilities and renovating some of them in some cases because GW is about the people.**

**This gathering today of our faculty at the Assembly is about the people who make GW what it is and without all of you, we don't do anything here. We don't teach. We don't do research. We don't provide service to the community. So I want to first thank all of you for your service to George Washington University. It's very important that we have each and every one of our faculty members feel the honor of being here and that we honor your presence.**

**I want to welcome the new faculty members to our community. I think it's a community that's warm and embraces new people. We do that with a couple thousand freshmen every year but we also do that with new faculty. Welcome to all of you here. There is something I think really exciting that's going on at the University.**

**Eighteen months ago the University adopted, and the Board adopted, a Strategic Plan. The plan's four pillars - innovation, globalization, governance and policy and citizenship and leadership - I think have served us well and allowed us to move with great speed toward our goals. So we are very happy with what took place under Provost Lerman's leadership and President Knapp's leadership with that plan.**

**Let me give you an update, but I need to first talk about what happened last year. So last year, I came to this Assembly and I was new. I said we were going to review faculty governance in one year and make a series of recommendations. That turned out to be overly ambitious and I have been**



Remarks by Nelson A. Carbonell, Jr., Chair, GW Board of Trustees

accused of that in the past. So I have to say, with some apologies, that it's going to take us longer than that.

At the conclusion of last year, I think with a very fruitful collaboration with many of you, with the Faculty Senate, and with some of the committees of the Senate, we were able to outline five areas that were of interest to everyone. One of those was academic freedom and I'm happy to say that at our meeting in June, just prior to our Board of Trustees retreat, we adopted the new provisions in the *Faculty Code* for academic freedom. I think it's the cornerstone of the community we've built here that everyone has the academic freedoms that we expect. I think the new language is quite appropriate given some of the modernizations that have happened in terms of speech and where we send our faculty.

Other areas really required more study. So in June, the Board adopted a resolution that effectively set to work four working groups. Those working groups are charged with reviewing four areas which I'll talk about in a second and, they have a one year deadline. I think it's important to give people deadlines and then sometimes, they might miss them.

Let me just recap for you what those working groups are up to. So that's four working groups; 43 members. There are eight trustees, four members of the Faculty Senate executive committee. In addition, there are 12 university and school administrators and 19 faculty members representing all 10 of our schools. By the end of this week, each of these working groups will have met three times and they are charged with really looking at four areas in terms of how we govern ourselves as an institution.

I just want to take one step back and note how important it is for the Board and the faculty to collaborate on this because it's the way that we communicate what the framework is under which we operate. You know, the Administration is different. They work for us and we have a different hierarchical relationship with them. With you, it's a much more collaborative relationship. It's collaborative with the administration as well.

Each of these areas came out in a series of meetings that we held last year. We held about 27 or 28 meetings, met with about 800 faculty members and also had a questionnaire that circulated amongst the faculty and these areas emerged. The first is participation. We have many full-time faculty that don't happen to be tenured that would like to participate more actively in the governance of the institution. We need to look at where it's appropriate to have that and there's a working group that is charged with looking at that. They are also looking at eligibility, and who is full time and I think it's an exciting area because we want to make sure that all of our faculty members feel like they're part of this community and have a say in what we do.

## Remarks by Nelson A. Carbonell, Jr., Chair, GW Board of Trustees

The second group is working on appointment, promotion and tenure processes and really, fundamentally, how the system currently works. Currently the Board of Trustees reviews every tenure case. I have to be honest, we are not qualified to do that. We need to think about the mechanisms by which we grant tenure. I think that working group has gotten off to a good start in looking at what has been done at GW, and also what has been done in our different schools. There are differences from school to school and the question is whether or not we can adopt some best practices there.

The third area is appointment and review of academic administrators, in particular, deans. We want to make sure that our deans get feedback from their faculty and the administration, and see that is done in a way that can help them be better deans. Also, as we select them and move forward, we can assess those processes and make sure, again, that we have the ability to get the best deans that we possibly can at the institution.

The last area is school rules and procedures. This may seem somewhat mundane but in each school and in some cases at the departmental level, the faculty have adopted certain procedures and we've gotten over time a misalignment in terms of how those work. What we want to do is build a framework that says, "We want you to have procedures about this in these areas."

In some cases those don't exist, and just because I'm an engineer I can draw this contrast. The Engineering School rules and procedures are about three pages long and the Law School's are over 40. So, they must say exactly the same thing.

Anyhow, those groups are off and running. I think we're expecting hard work from all the members of those groups and also for them to bring to us collectively a set of recommendations in each of those areas, which we will then use to decide how to move forward. We may, as we did last year, adopt some changes. We may decide further review is necessary. I think it's really up to those groups to make their recommendations.

I want to close with our goal as a Board, and I hope our goal collectively as a community at the George Washington University, is to move the University to be amongst the most respected and admired institutions of higher learning in the world. I can tell you that we can only do that together. I'm counting on all of you for your support and I pledge to you our support. So thank you very much for your attention.

## **Remarks by Steven Knapp, President, George Washington University**

A few years ago, I was asked by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to use this occasion to provide, in effect, a state of the University update for our colleagues and I'm very happy to do that. I'm glad to welcome you again to another academic year and did want to extend a special welcome to the new faculty, those who have been able to join us, but also those who couldn't be here today. As you heard, it's a rather long list of new colleagues and I hope that you will, as we do every year, make a special effort to make them feel welcome as new members of our community and give them a sense of what it's like to be here in Washington DC, an exciting and sometimes challenging city, particularly from a transportation perspective. But I know they'll really value your collegiality and your support as they move into their new faculty positions.

And I also want to extend a special welcome to the new faculty who are joining us from the Corcoran College of Art and Design which is the now the Corcoran School of the Arts and Design within the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences. I think this is a tremendously exciting moment for the University to advance its position as a true hub for the arts and culture in the heart of our nation's capital. It's pretty extraordinary to have a school of the Arts and Design located just across the street from the White House.

I think it's important for what it adds to the academic profile of the University. It really helps us become even more comprehensive as a University in the heart of the nation's capital -- already the largest University in the nation's capital but also it has an important symbolic significance as we consider the status of arts education in an era in which there's a good deal of discussion in the media constantly about the importance of STEM disciplines - science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Of course, we're making great strides in all of those fields as well and we will continue to do so. But part of that is driven by a concern for the vitality of the U.S. economy as a center of innovation and what it takes to keep us at the forefront of international competitiveness.

I think there is a utilitarian consideration for taking the arts just as seriously as those other disciplines because they are not only the source of ongoing creativity and innovation, but they're also an incredibly important part of the culture of any nation. I think for the capital of that nation to have at its heart a leading institution of arts education is incredibly important and so I think we'll have an opportunity to create an even stronger model of arts education, reaching out to the community surrounding us as well as nationally and internationally, with this new partnership that really adds to the University an incredibly valuable gem, and that gem is the School.

It's hard for me to go anywhere in Washington D.C. where people don't ask me if we own all of downtown Washington. We do not in fact own all of downtown Washington D.C., though we own a good chunk of it. But you know that's all for the sake of supporting our mission and that mission I think is going to be furthered in extraordinary ways by our new partnership with the Corcoran. So, welcome to our new colleagues from the Corcoran.

I think the Chair has already said a lot about what's going on in the University and touched on a number of those areas and I won't go through all of

## Remarks by Steven Knapp, President, George Washington University

those. It's clear that we are continuing to advance under the broad rubric that was established by the Board's unanimous approval and adoption of our Strategic Plan and pretty much everything we're doing can be seen as an alignment with what is laid out in that very fine document which had a good deal of faculty input.

One thing we set about in that process... I don't know how many, I've lost count of the number of meetings that the Provost had, the dinners and so on, and other kinds of meetings with the faculty groups to talk about the strategic plan. It was very much a collaborative effort and a collaborative product. It is setting the course for the University's progress toward its bicentennial in 2021.

Part of that progress is expressed in capital projects that you see all around you. This year is a culmination of some capital projects that have been under way for some period of time. Last spring, we opened the new home of the Milken Institute School of Public Health. If you haven't had the chance to tour that building, I encourage you to do so. It's rather beautiful. It actually has outside of it what I understand is the first public sculpture to be erected by a major modern Greek sculptor. This is George Zongolopoulos whose work *Poseidon* is now in the park that stands behind the Milken Institute School of Public Health building right on Washington Circle.

It's an oddly shaped triangular piece of land that none of us anticipated could be so beautifully filled out by the architectural marvel which is this new school. If you go inside, you'll see that there's a large atrium that has a stairway going up to the center. You're encouraged to take the stairs. In fact, you're discouraged from not taking the stairs by some interesting devices.

One of those is the placement of the elevators off to the side where they're hard to find. When you get to them, the doors are actually set to open and close in a frustratingly slow manner so that you're encouraged to move over to the stairs. There are standing desks everywhere. It's Public Health, right? They are true to their mission. The building has been rated LEED platinum which is the highest LEED certification. It is an extraordinary addition but what's also important is what's going on there. This is thanks to the largest gift the University has ever received which is a combination of \$80 million for public health with a particular focus on prevention and wellness.

We are in a position to have a tremendous impact nationally and internationally on some of those most challenging issues that face the human population which include the challenge of chronic diseases associated with obesity which by some estimation actually cost the U.S. economy something like a trillion dollars a year. Interestingly one of the worst effects of obesity is actually depression which has a tremendously devastating effect on productivity and other aspects of life.

The fact that we're taking a leadership position in addressing that issue and doing so right here in proximity to the policy community, I think will play a very important role in sort of moving the needle on these very challenging health problems and particularly at a time when the Affordable Care Act is going to be

## **Remarks by Steven Knapp, President, George Washington University**

transforming the landscape of healthcare across the nation. For us to be right at the heart of that with this important new landmark building will be very significant.

This spring, we are opening two new buildings. One of those is the Science and Engineering Hall which will be occupied both by the Columbian College of Art and Science and the School of Engineering and Applied Science. At the same time we'll also have space for research in areas like cancer and public health. We are going to have those programs in some of the space on the top two floors. I think the Hall will be a tremendously exciting addition to our campus. It will be our largest academic building.

The new Hall is about a half million square foot building, and by the way, the plan to do this goes back to a 2004 resolution of the Faculty Senate which identified the need to upgrade and do something about the very obsolete laboratory facilities that our scientists and engineers were confined to. Our faculty took the lead to really make a difference in that respect and so, that led to this project which I think is going to be, again, really transformational for the University.

I'm happy to say that just down the street here, down 21st Street at the corner of G and 21st, we'll be opening this spring, it's already complete from a construction point of view, but the first exhibitions will be opening in March. That's the new University museum which will be housed in the historic Woodhull House and by the way, that's right where the University started in 1912 when it moved here from its prior two locations where the University was founded.

For the information of new faculty, GW was founded in 1821 but originally was located just north of Florida Avenue on a narrow strip of land running about a half mile uphill, then moved downtown to the other side of Lafayette Square. We arrived in this location in Foggy Bottom in 1912 at that corner of G and 21st Street which is now occupied by a part of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences and by the Law School. In fact, in 1924, there was a strategic plan that I was given a copy of by one of our alumni that actually shows the entire University as a single massive building on that city block between 21st and 20th Streets and on G and H Streets. That's kind of the heart of where the University was initially located --in Woodhull House on the corner right opposite the Tonic Restaurant in the Quigley's Pharmacy building. We're going to be housing the Washingtoniana Collection of Albert Small there -- a world-class collection of historical materials. Behind that in the beautiful new building which I hope you've had a chance to walk by or see, attached by a pedestrian bridge to the Woodhull House, is a space that will house the Textile Museum.

The Textile Museum is another world-class collection that is moving onto our campus from its former location in the Kalorama neighborhood and it will have many important academic connections to a wide range of departments including Anthropology, Middle Eastern Studies, Asian Studies, Africana Studies, and of course, Fine Arts, Art History and Museum Studies. It's going to be a very, very important addition to the University.

That will complement our new partnership with the Corcoran. I think there will be a lot of cross-fertilization there even though those two projects were

## **Remarks by Steven Knapp, President, George Washington University**

planned entirely, independent of each other. The possibility of our merger with the Corcoran didn't even arise until last January -- it came as an opportunity when the Corcoran Board of Trustees decided to give the College to our University.

By the way, I should clarify one thing. There has been an impression out there in some of the media that the University purchased the Corcoran. In fact, it was gift from the Board of Trustees of the Corcoran Gallery and the Corcoran College of Art and Design. It also came with some assets that will help us with our renovation of the building that was already mentioned. It's already underway. I think that's all tremendously exciting

Finally, although it's not going to be opening this year, it will be opening shortly, is the new residence hall just adjacent to this building. You probably saw it out the window as you were coming into, the Marvin Center today. That project is taking three former residence halls and combining them into a single building which will be a large residence hall. It will also have a kind of community activity center for students in the heart of the building. We think it will further enhance the sense of community and residential life on our campus.

This is something we're required to do by our arrangement with the District of Columbia in which we agreed that we would house a certain percentage of our undergraduates on campus rather than in the neighborhoods. This is something we had to do but we're really taking advantage of that requirement.

We were also given the right to build our academic facilities at the same time and in part because we're able to take the buildings up to a higher level than was previously permitted, from 90 to 130 feet. It makes a huge difference in terms of the available space that we have on campus. I think it will really make a difference in the life of our student community on campus as well.

It's great to have these new facilities. But of course what really matters is the teaching and the research that goes on in those facilities. I'm happy to say that our research has continued to grow and this is a bit of surprise in the national context. As you probably have seen in the media reports, research funding has been flattening out and in some cases declining from the major sponsoring agencies and many universities are seeing a downturn.

We actually saw, from fiscal year 2014 over fiscal year 2013 an 11% increase in sponsored research. The notion of having a double-digit increase in research at a time when the national picture is really going in the other direction is remarkable. That surpassed our expectations. We have projected somewhere between 6 and 9 percent growth, which would also be extraordinary in this environment. To go beyond that to 11% is pretty remarkable.

To support all these activities, the facilities as well as the teaching and to make our University as affordable as possible to its graduate and undergraduate students, we have launched just this past June our comprehensive \$1 billion dollar campaign. I'm happy to say that we're already more than halfway to the \$1 billion dollar goal. We've raised a little more \$520 million toward that goal. Last year was our biggest year ever.

## **Remarks by Steven Knapp, President, George Washington University**

Again, not surprisingly, perhaps because of the Public Health gift, we're expecting to come pretty close to that again this year because of a number of other opportunities that are already lined up. The campaign is focused on supporting our students, enhancing our academic programs and, of course, breaking new ground in many different fields that are going to reflect the marriage between the interests of prospective donors and the talents and ambitions of our faculty and students.

A lot of what we're going to be focusing on will be to increase resources for the support of faculty scholarship. I just want to say in closing these brief remarks that a few weeks ago we had our Alumni Weekend. It was the largest attendance we've ever had. You know, it has been building year after year. That's a good sign for future support for the University, not just financially but in terms of opening opportunities for our students when they graduate. We now have a community of alumni that numbers 250,000, a quarter of a million living alumni all around the world.

We had about 3,000 alumni who came to our reunion weekend. We had 60 events for them, so it was a very active weekend. I think everybody enjoyed it. What was really impressive to me was how many of the alumni that I encountered personally commented on the faculty members who had changed their lives while they were students here.

How constant is that theme that arises in conversations that we have all had with alumni. I see Dean Vinson is nodding. Other alumni also remark on how the campus is being transformed by the number of projects underway. They're sort of awestruck in many cases because it's so different from what it was in the years when they were here.

Despite all the changes, what they keep coming back to is the impact that you and your predecessors and your colleagues have made on their lives and, of course, that's what we're all about here.

It's now my pleasure to turn the program over to Provost Lerman for his remarks. Thank you.

FROM GW TODAY

## Vision 2021 Will Guide Academic Year

Provost Steven Lerman shares new plans, budget models developed for 2014-15 at Faculty Assembly.



Provost Steven Lerman gives remarks at Faculty Assembly.

October 07, 2014

By Julyssa Lopez

Vision 2021, the George Washington University's 10-year strategic plan, will be at the center of new efforts and developments planned this academic year, Provost Steven Lerman said at Tuesday's Faculty Assembly.

He described research and international strategies as well as an updated budget model that will support the implementation of the strategic plan.

In May 2013, GW's Board of Trustees unanimously approved the 10-year Vision 2021 strategic plan, which outlines specific actions the university will take in education, service initiatives and research.



## FROM GW TODAY

Already, the university has made progress implementing the strategic plan, Dr. Lerman said. Working toward the goal of admitting students to the university at large rather than to specific programs or schools, the university has removed barriers to students changing majors and transferring among GW's schools, a change that has encouraged collaborative and cross-disciplinary learning. In January, Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion Terri Harris Reed began working on a Citizenship and Leadership Committee that will seek leadership opportunities for students both within and outside the university.

The new Sustainability Institute headed by Kathleen Merrigan, former deputy secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the recently launched Autism and Neurodevelopmental Disorders Initiative also promote multi-disciplinary research detailed in the strategic plan.

GW will continue building on Vision 2021 with international strategies that educate students about global issues. The university successfully hosted Brasilia Without Borders, a summer program that brought 400 students from Brasilia to campus, and formed an advisory committee of faculty members to recommend opportunities for exchanges in China. This upcoming year, Dr. Lerman said, the university will ramp up international student recruiting in other countries and enhance services for current international students.

"The focus is on how we move this university to have more aspects that both educate our students on global issues and make them competent in a highly globalized world," Dr. Lerman said.

Dr. Lerman added that he is working with deans and faculty members in the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate School of Education and Human Development to launch the strategic plan's STEM Academy, a center that will focus on the best techniques for STEM education. The academy is projected to open in tandem with the new Science and Engineering Hall (SEH).

As graduate enrollment declined throughout the country, GW saw dips in its own numbers and will work this year to enhance graduate studies. The university was 1 percent short of its projected budget for fiscal year 2015 due to smaller tuition revenues and slightly higher expenditures. The university made up the difference through cuts and reductions in non-academic expenditures.

Dr. Lerman said his office will work with each school to restore graduate revenue and expand enrollment. The university also is moving seven of its schools toward a more flexible budgeting model that will encourage growth, increase accountability, create incentives and support the strategic plan. GW is also building out a five-year budget cycle to allow for long-term financial planning, Dr. Lerman said.

"We still will approve our budget year by year, but this will give us a sense of how we as a university think our finances are going, and it will enable each school to have a five-year plan that it can craft and change over time," Dr. Lerman said.

## FROM GW TODAY

Tuesday's meeting also included introductions of new faculty members. The Columbian College of Arts and Sciences has the most additions this year, with many professors transferring from the former Corcoran College.

President Steven Knapp welcomed new faculty and gave an update on the university, including the implementation of the historic agreements with the Corcoran and the National Gallery of Art, the new George Washington University Museum and The Textile Museum, the Science and Engineering Hall and District House. What matters most about these facilities, Dr. Knapp said, is the teaching and learning that will happen in them. He said that during last month's Alumni Weekend, many former Colonials approached him to share stories about how they've been deeply influenced by faculty members who taught them at GW.

"They keep coming back to the impact you, your colleagues and predecessors have made on their lives," Dr. Knapp said.

Board of Trustees Chair Nelson A. Carbonell, B.S. '85, gave an update on the faculty governance review, a two-year process that the board began last year in collaboration with faculty.

In June, Mr. Carbonell charged four working groups with reviewing faculty participation in governance, tenure procedures, dean appointments and performance reviews and school procedures. Each group has a one-year deadline to recommend improvements in their areas to the Board of Trustees. Last year, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution addressing a fifth principle, academic freedom, following a review by the Faculty Governance Task Force, the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The resolution was adopted at the Board of Trustees' June meeting.

"Our goal as a board and community is to move the university among the most respected and admired institutions in the world. We can only do that together—I'm counting on all of you for your support, and I pledge to you our support," Mr. Carbonell said.

Charles A. Garris, chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, gave a report on the Faculty Senate, which will meet this Friday. He concluded Faculty Assembly by saying that he is confident that the collaboration among GW's faculty, the administration and the Board of Trustees will result in significant improvements in shared governance.

"Shared governance has served us very well. Working side by side with the Board of Trustees and the administration on a wide range of issues, the faculty has had a large impact on the directions and policies of the university," Dr. Garris said.

"I'm very optimistic that at the Faculty Assembly taking place one year from today, the chair of the Executive Committee will report that as a result of the improvements in the Faculty Code and other governance documents resulting from the Board of Trustees' efforts, shared governance will be even stronger."